IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS TYLER DIVISION

RICHARD DAVID PETERSON,	§ § 8	
Plaintiff,	8 § s	
v.	§	Case No. 6:23-cv-471-JDK-JDL
GREGG COUNTY SHERIFF'S	§ §	
OFFICE,	§ 8	
Defendant.	§ §	
	§	

ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Plaintiff Richard David Peterson, proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition.

On October 31, 2023, Judge Love issued a Report recommending that the Court dismiss this case with prejudice for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Docket No. 8. Even with the benefit of an extension to file objections, no objections have been received.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc),

superseded on other grounds by statute, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to

file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff has not filed objections. The Court therefore reviews the

Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal

conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. See United States v.

Wilson, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding

that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review

is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case,

the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to

law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the

United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 8) as the findings of this Court. It is

therefore **ORDERED** that this case is **DISMISSED** with prejudice for failure to

state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 17th day of January, 2024.

EREMY D. KERNODLE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

2